a stimulus that will cost taxpayers nothing by freeing our small businesses and especially our entrepreneurial and high-tech businesses from the burdens of all this paperwork and instead let them focus on growing, on listing their IPOs in America for the benefit of the American economy. That is what we should be doing, and that is what the editorial says.

I hope very much my colleagues will listen and we will be able to pass the Hutchison-Landrieu amendment, hopefully by voice vote. This should be a unanimous amendment passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to propound a unanimous consent request. It has been cleared on both sides. I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate consider the following two amendments: Senator CORKER of Tennessee, amendment No. 4034, and Senator CARPER of Delaware, amendment No. 4071, which is side-by-side to the Corker amendment; that the amendments be debated concurrently for a total of 30 minutes, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators CARPER and CORKER or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Corker amendment, to be followed by a vote in relation to the Carper amendment, with no amendment in order to either amendment prior to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BEGICH).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESTORING AMERICAN FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT OF 2010—Continued

ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today I, along with 67 other Senators, sent a letter to President Obama on an issue that has concerned the Congress since the late 1980s.

Our letter, signed by more than two-thirds of the Senate, commends the President for conducting a comprehensive review of the U.S. Government's policy on antipersonnel mines. That review has been underway for some time, and I expect it will be completed later this summer.

It has involved consultations with the Department of Defense including active and retired U.S. military officers, the Department of State including current and former U.S. diplomats, key military allies, and humanitarian and arms control organizations. The review has examined the historical record, asked rigorous questions, and solicited a wide range of views.

I want to thank the Senators who joined me and Senator VOINOVICH in signing this letter, which states our belief that through a thorough, deliberative review the administration can identify any obstacles to joining the Ottawa Treaty banning the production, use, transfer and stockpiling of antipersonnel mines, and develop a plan to overcome them as soon as possible.

The treaty has been signed by 158 countries, including our NATO allies whose troops are fighting with our forces in Afghanistan and Iraq, and by every other country in this hemisphere except Cuba.

This issue has a long history, and I do not have time to recount it in detail today. But suffice it to say that 13 years ago the United States missed an opportunity to play a leadership role in the international effort to ban antipersonnel mines, which culminated in the treaty. Although our country declined to join the treaty then, as early as 1994 President Clinton announced to the United Nations General Assembly his support for ridding the world of antipersonnel mines, and a plan to develop alternatives to these weapons with the intent of joining the treaty by 2006.

That date came and went, alternatives were developed, and U.S. troops have fought in two wars without, to the best of our knowledge, using these weapons. In the meantime, most of our closest allies have renounced antipersonnel mines, and their militaries long ago made the necessary doctrinal and technological adjustments to meet their force protection needs in accordance with the requirements of the treaty.

Antipersonnel landmines, which are triggered by the victim, have no place in the arsenal of a modern military. They function like some of the IEDs used by insurgents in Afghanistan and Iraq that have caused so many casualties of innocent people, as well as U.S. and coalition forces. Landmines are inherently indiscriminate, and no matter how sophisticated the technology they do not distinguish between a combatant and a civilian. They can be dropped by aircraft or disbursed by artillery by the thousands over wide areas. In today's fast moving battlefield where mobility is a priority, they can pose as much of a danger to our own forces as to the enemy.

Thirteen years ago the Pentagon argued that we should continue to stockpile antipersonnel mines. They said these weapons might be necessary in Korea or in a mechanized war against enemy armor.

But ownership and control of the mines in the Korean DMZ have been transferred to South Korea, and the United States has renounced the use of these types of mines, including in Korea. While there is the possibility that one day we may find ourselves in a conventional war against a major world power, antipersonnel landmines would have little if any utility or relevance in such a war. Rather than our own troops needing these weapons, if our adversary were so lacking in more effective weapons as to use them, our troops would not need antipersonnel mines they would need effective countermine technology.

There have been other arguments made, none of which are persuasive. For example:

Some have asked, after landmines what is the next weapon the Pentagon will be asked to give up? Isn't this a slippery slope for those seeking to ban other types of weapons? This hypothetical question has nothing to do with antipersonnel landmines, which are in a unique category of weapons that are designed to be triggered by the victim.

They are not like bullets or bombs that are aimed or targeted by a soldier. They are inherently indiscriminate, activated by whoever comes into contact with them, whether an enemy soldier, a refugee woman searching for firewood, or a child. Renouncing landmines should have no bearing on U.S. policy toward other weapons.

I have heard it asked how we can ensure that our troops can operate in coalitions with countries that are not parties to the treaty, for example South Korea. The answer is the same way as the NATO countries that have signed the treaty whose troops are fighting in coalition with our forces in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Why join the treaty when we are in de facto compliance already? What would we gain at this point? First, this question implicitly acknowledges that the United States does not require antipersonnel landmines. We have not used them since 1991, we have not exported them since 1992, we have not produced them since 1997 and the Pentagon has no plan to do so in the future.

It is important to recognize that the United States is not causing the mine problem today, although mines we exported to dozens of countries, or that are left over from past wars involving U.S. forces especially in Southeast Asia, continue to kill and injure civilians.

But most importantly, it would be a mistake to underestimate or devalue the positive reaction, practical effects and depth of goodwill toward the United States and our military that would result from joining the treaty. Other countries know the United States, the world's most powerful nation, needs to be part of multilateral agreements if those agreements are to achieve their goals. And they know the United States needs to be part of the solution to the landmine problem,